

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated August 31, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire November 30, 2004. In the present office action, Claims 5, 17 and 24 are amended. Claims 1-34 are pending.

Applicants note with appreciation the teleconference held on November 29, 2004 with the Examiner. No agreement was reached during this teleconference.

## **OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS**

In paragraph 2 of the present office action, the Examiner has objected to Figure 1 for lack of descriptive detail for elements 120, 130, 140 and 150. In paragraph 3 of the present office action, the Examiner has objected to Figure 2 for showing steps 235 and 255 without a corresponding reference in the written specification.

Figure 1 is submitted herein as a replacement sheet to reflect that elements 120, 130, 150 and 150 are respectively first, second, third, and fourth devices.

An amendment to the specification is submitted herein to reconcile the written specification with Steps 235 and 255 shown in Figure 2.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

## **OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT**

In paragraph 4 of the present office action, a typographical error on line 21 of the abstract ("is" should be "are") is objected to by the Examiner. A corrective amendment is attached herewith. Applicants now respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In Paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mori* (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,839 B2 – "*Mori*") in view of *Odenwald* (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,727 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Attached is a declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, signed by the co-inventors of the invention described and claimed in the present application, declaring an inventive date prior to 01 February 2000, which is the effective filing date of *Mori*. Thus, *Mori* is not available to the Examiner as prior art.

With regards to exemplary Claim 6, none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests "reporting a fault condition in response to said enhanced logical address and said physical slot location of said selected device not being identical due to a connector defect at said physical slot location." (See for example page 4, lines 9-15 and page 6, lines 6-10.) As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest this limitation, Applicants respectfully request the Claim 6 (and similarly Claims 17 and 24) be allowed.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0465**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
*Registration No. 44,545*  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

Attached is a corrected Figure 1, showing additional descriptors for elements 120, 130, 140 and 150, as supported by the written specification (including page 13). No new matter is added.